OIPE
JUL 30 2004
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

AF / IHU

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

re application of: **French et al.**

Serial No.: **09,737,346**

Filed: **December 15, 2000**

For: **Flexible Result Data Structure and Multi-Node Logging for a Multi-Node Application System**

35525
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

§ Group Art Unit: **2151**
§
§ Examiner: **Phillips, Hassan A.**
§
§ Attorney Docket No.: **AUS9-2000-0457-US1**
§
§
§
§

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 27, 2004.

By: Carrie Parker
Carrie Parker

TRANSMITTAL DOCUMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:
ENCLOSED HEREWITH:

- Appellant's Brief (in triplicate) (37 C.F.R. 1.192); and
- Our return postcard.

A fee of $330.00 is required for filing an Appellant's Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

Duke W. Yee
Registration No. 34,285
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 367-2001
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS

OIPE JUL 30 2004 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **French et al.**	§	
	§	Group Art Unit: **2151**
Serial No. **09/737,346**	§	
	§	Examiner: **Phillips, Hassan A.**
Filed: **December 15, 2000**	§	
	§	
For: **Flexible Result Data Structure and Multi-Node Logging for a Multi-Node Application System**	§	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 27, 2004.

By: Carrie Parker
Carrie Parker

APPELLANT'S BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 1.192)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on June 7, 2004.

The fees required under § 1.17(c), and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief is transmitted in triplicate. (37 C.F.R. 1.192(a))

08/02/2004 WASFAW1 00000017 090447 09737346
01 FC:1402 330.00 DA

REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interference's that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interference's.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-51

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims canceled: none
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: none
3. Claims pending: 1-51
4. Claims allowed: none
5. Claims rejected: 1-51

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-51

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment after final has been filed for the present application.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

Many computer software applications are designed such that some processes or tasks are executed on one computer while other processes/tasks are executed on another computer, with the results combined at perhaps still another computer. Each sub-process running on a computer may generate a set of messages and/or log files, and many times these messages and log files need to be sent back to the originating computer. With the increasing globalization of business, many businesses may find that their computing IT resources are distributed across several countries with servers in one country generating messages and log files in one locale and computers in another country generating messages and log files in a different locale. The present invention is directed to a technique for translating message/log information in a distributed computing environment, to facilitate differing languages when the distributed computing environment spans multiple countries/locales. Message/log results of executing a task at a node are received at another node, and modified if necessary to create second results. These second results are sent to yet another node, where they are modified if necessary, and then sent to the original task execution requesting node. By providing modification and filtering at a plurality of intervening nodes, it is possible to accommodate a plurality of differing locales at the plurality of intervening nodes.

Referring now to FIG. 4 of the present application, there are shown a plurality of data processing nodes 402-412, where results from one piece of a distributed application executed on one node, such as node 408, are returned to an upstream node, such as node 406, where the results can be manipulated by modifying or appending the received results with other results, such as those received by node 410 or those generated at node 406 itself (Specification page 10, lines 1-11). Since the various nodes may use different locales (e.g. English, Spanish, French, German, etc) and the requesting client node 402 may use still another locale, upon receipt of results by a given receiving node, the received results may be modified, translated and/or appended to other entries by the receiving node (Specification page 11, lines 28-31). Furthermore, the receiving node may take all, part or none of the received results and place those entries in its own results array (Specification page 11, 18-28). By providing modification and filtering at a plurality of intervening nodes and appending such filtered modifications to an

existing log file, it is possible to accommodate a plurality of differing locales at the plurality of intervening nodes.

ISSUES

A. Whether Claims 1, 18 and 35 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079) and further in view of Kahn et al. (U.S. 6,574,628).

B. Whether Claims 2, 19 and 36 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079), and further in view of Moharram (U.S. Patent 6,079,036).

C. Whether Claims 3-9, 20-26 and 37-43 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079), and further in view of Moharram (U.S. Patent 6,079,036), and further in view of Otteson (U.S. Patent 5,867,659).

D. Whether Claims 10-17, 27-34 and 44-51 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079), and further in view of Moharram (U.S. Patent 6,079,036), and further in view of Kahn et al. (U.S. 6,574,628).

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The claims do not stand or fall together, and Appellants consider the following groups of claims to be separately patentable:

Group I: Claims 1, 7-9, 18, 24-26, 35 and 41-43

Group II: Claims 2-6, 19-23 and 36-40

Group III: Claims 10, 12-17, 27, 29-34, 44 and 46-51

Group IV: Claims 11, 28 and 45

Appellants consider the claims of Group II to be separately patentable by reciting that result messages comprise at least one log entry.

Appellants consider the claims of Group III to be separately patentable by reciting modifying and appending steps at a first node.

Appellants consider the claims of Group IV to be separately patentable by reciting a step of transmitting the modified result to a requesting node.

ARGUMENT

A. The Examiner rejected Claim 1, 18 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611), in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079) and further in view of Kahn et al. (U.S. 6,574,628). This rejection is shown to be in error as follows.

With respect to Claim 1, such claim recites a second node, a requesting client node, and two intervening nodes (a first node and a third node). Both of the two intervening nodes *modify a portion of the results received* by the respective node, the results being results of execution from a task executed on another node. Specifically, Claim 1 recites:

> receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node in the networked data processing system, wherein the first results comprise an array of result messages;
>
> modifying, at the first node, at least one of the result messages to create second results, wherein the second results comprise a second array of result messages including the modified result message(s);
>
> receiving, at a third node, the second results;
>
> modifying, at the third node, at least one of the second result messages to create third results, wherein the third results comprise a third array of result messages including the modified second result message(s); and
>
> sending the third results to a requesting client node.

The cited Navarre reference only contemplates using a single node – the gateway – to modify another node's results. In an attempt to overcome this deficiency, the Examiner cites Kahn Col. 16, lines 65-67 and Col. 17, lines 1-14 and Figure 8. Appellants show that there, Kahn states:

> "Each of the directories 138, 140, 142 on computers 132, 134, 136 is likely to have its own naming and addressing conventions. The service station at computer 130 may be set up so that the user's query is phrased in accordance with a common protocol, and the service stations at the other computers may include conversion routines that *convert the incoming request at each directory from the common protocol to a form that permits direct querying of that directory. The result of the query may then be inserted into the Knowbot program, which then*

proceeds to the next directory. Each of the service stations serves temporarily as a "hotel" for the Knowbot program during the time when the query is being executed there.

When the Knowbot program has completed its rounds and returns to computer 130 carrying the results of the multiple accesses, an extension or enhancement of the local service station may convert back from the common protocol to a format useful for local display of the information."

As can be seen, this passage teaches that an incoming request (in this example, a directory query command) can be converted into a form usable by the receiving node. This passage also teaches that the result of the query (i.e. the resulting data generated by this node as a result of searching its directory) can then be inserted into the Knowbot program and subsequently proceeds to the next directory. Of notable distinction is that there is no teaching or suggestion of modifying, in multiple nodes, any results of task execution from another node. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of "*receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node* in the networked data processing system, wherein the first results comprise an array of result messages", "*modifying, at the first node, at least one of the result messages* to create second results, wherein the second results comprise a second array of result messages including the modified result message(s)", "receiving, at a third node, the second results", and *modifying, at the third node, at least one of the second result messages* to create third results, wherein the third results comprise a third array of result messages including the modified second result message(s)".

Per Claim 1, results of task execution from one node are received and modified by another node. While the passage cited at Kahn teaches converting an incoming command to a form that permits direct querying of that directory, this incoming command is not "first results of execution from a task executed on second node", nor is this query command modified to create second results, wherein the second results comprise a second array of result messages, as required by Claim 1. While Kahn also teaches that the query results are inserted into a program, these query results are not subsequently modified by another intervening node. Kahn also mentions a protocol conversion when the Knowbot program has completed its rounds (Col. 17, lines 10-14), and an ability to organize the received results in accordance with a user's

preferences (Col. 17, lines 14-20). This protocol conversion and data re-organization is only done in a single node, the local Knowbot service station that originally generated the request (Col. 16, lines 50-55; Col. 17, lines 10-12). In contrast, Claim 1 is directed to *a plurality of nodes which modify task results received from another node.* Thus, the cited Kahn reference does not make up for the deficiency in the teachings of Navarro and Wang, and thus a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made with respect to Claim 1[1]. Because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made, the burden has not shifted to Appellants to rebut an obviousness assertion, and the claims have been erroneously rejected due to such prima facie failure[2].

In addition, due to Navarre's gateway architecture, where upon receipt of a request, a set of data access transactions, *each associated with a respective server application*, is automatically identified, Navarre's gateway node requires a one-to-one association between itself and a respective server application (Col. 3, lines 9-11). Navarre maintains process control tables that explicitly define the processing requirements of the client request and identify the data access transactions that must be executed to satisfy the request (Col. 3, lines 11-18), including specific authorization, formatting, etc. for the desired server application (Col. 3, lines 18-25). Thus, there would have been no motivation or desire to modify the teachings of Navarre in accordance with the claimed invention to include a plurality of intervening nodes each capable of modifying received results from another node, due to the unique one-to-one mapping between Navarre's gateway node and the desired server application node. The fact that a prior art device could be modified so as to produce the claimed device is not a basis for an obviousness rejection unless the prior art suggested the desirability of such a modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). There is simply no suggestion of any desire for such modification in the Navarre reference, or in any of the other cited references. Thus, Claim 1 is further shown to have been erroneously rejected.

---

[1] To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03. *See also, In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

[2] In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Only if that burden is met, does the burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shift to the applicant. Id. If the examiner fails to establish a prima facie case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 1 advantageously provides the ability to translate or modify information in a widely distributed application environment, where intervening nodes can further delegate or sub-task a part of the requested application and accommodate data from differing locales having differing data types. None of the cited references teach or suggest this claimed feature (multi-node modification of the results from a downstream node(s)) or its resulting advantages.

Appellants show error in these the rejection of Claim 18 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claim 35 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1, 18 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is shown to be in error.

B. The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 19 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079), and further in view of Moharram (U.S. Patent 6,079,036). This rejection is shown to be in error as follows.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claim 2 for similar reasons to those described above regarding Claim 1 (of which Claim 2 depends upon), and show that none of the cited references (Navarre, Wang, Moharram) teach or suggest two intervening nodes that each *modify a portion of the results received* by the respective node, the results being results of execution from a task executed on another node. Nor has the Examiner alleged any such teaching or suggestion when rejecting such claims. Hence, the Examiner has failed to establish, or even allege, a prima facie showing of obvious. Therefore, Claim 2 is shown to have been erroneously rejected as all claimed features are not taught or suggested by the cited references. *In re Fine*, supra.

Appellants further urge that it is error to reconstruct the patentee's claimed invention from the prior art by using the patentee's claims as a "blueprint". When prior art references require selective combination to render obvious a subsequent invention, there must be some reason for the combination other than the hindsight obtained from the invention itself. *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 227 USPQ 543 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In

combining the teachings of Moharram with those of Navarre and Wang, the Examiner states that the motivation to combine these references is to provide the client with important administrative information together with the results requested by the client. However, Appellants urge that this motivation comes from the present application itself, and not from the cited references, thus evidencing improper hindsight analysis. In particular, Navarre is specifically directed to a system that immunizes/shields a user from the networking details. As stated by Navarre in the abstract:

> "The preferred embodiments provide the advantage of allowing a client application to communicate with a plurality of server applications without knowing the server application's format or syntax requirements. Further, unlike environments in which a client application compiles data received from each contacted server application, in the environment of the preferred embodiments, the client application is presented with a single, integrated response."

Because of this expressed desire by Navarre to shield the end-user from unnecessary details, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify such teaching to include maintenance information about the nodes, as urged by the Examiner as rationale for combining the references. Navarre expressly teaches a desire to shield the user from such details. Thus, the only motivation for such combination must be coming from the present application, which is improper hindsight analysis. Therefore, Claim 2 is further shown to have been erroneously rejected.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claims 19 and 36 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 2.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 2, 19 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is shown to be in error.

C. The Examiner rejected Claims 3-9, 20-26 and 37-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079), and further in view of Moharram (U.S. Patent 6,079,036), and further in view of Otteson (U.S. Patent 5,867,659). This rejection is shown to be in error as follows.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claims 3-9 for similar reasons to those described above regarding Claim 1 (of which Claims 3-9 ultimately depend upon), and show that none of the cited references (Navarre, Wang, Moharram, Otteson) teach or suggest two intervening nodes that each *modify a portion of the results received* by the respective node, the results being results of execution from a task executed on another node. Nor has the Examiner alleged any such teaching or suggestion when rejecting such claims. Hence, the Examiner has failed to establish, or even allege, a prima facie showing of obvious. Therefore, Claims 3-9 are shown to have been erroneously rejected as all claimed features are not taught or suggested by the cited references. *In re Fine*, supra.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claims 20-26 and 37-43 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claims 3-9.

Appellants further urge that due to the large number of references being used in rejecting Claims 3-9, 20-26 and 37-43, the Examiner must be using improper hindsight analysis, using the present invention itself as a blueprint to establish obviousness. It is error to reconstruct the patentee's claimed invention from the prior art by using the patentee's claims as a "blueprint". Because of this expressed desire by Navarre to shield the end-user from unnecessary details, as previously described above, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify such teaching to include maintenance information about the nodes, as urged by the Examiner as rationale for combining the references. Navarre expressly teaches a desire to shield the user from such details. Thus, the only motivation for such combination must be coming from the present application, which is improper hindsight analysis.

The Examiner then states that the motivation to combine the teachings of Otteson with Navarre/Wang/Moharram would be to provide a requesting user with important maintenance information about the nodes which are providing a result to the requesting client. Again, Applicants urge that this motivation comes from the present application itself, and not from the cited references, thus further evidencing improper hindsight analysis.

In summary, the references have been combined using improper hindsight analysis, and even when improperly combined, there are still missing claimed elements – strongly evidencing non-obviousness. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 3-9, 20-26 and 37-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is shown to be in error.

D. The Examiner rejected Claims 10-17, 27-34 and 44-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,611) in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,079), and further in view of Moharram (U.S. Patent 6,079,036), and further in view of Kahn et al. (U.S. 6,574,628). This rejection is shown to be in error as follows.

With respect to Claim 10, such claim emphasizes further important aspects of the claimed invention, wherein results from a piece of a distributed application executed on one node and returned to an upstream node can be manipulated by modifying message/log files into the locale of a requesting client and by appending such results onto results for the upstream node. Specifically, Claim 10 recites "*modifying*, at the first node, at least one of the log messages in the set of log messages received in the result to produce a modified result and *appending* the modified result to an existing log system on the first node, the existing log system comprising a first node result of execution from one or more tasks executed by the first node" (emphasis added). In contrast, the teachings of the cited Navarre reference describe a gateway node that receives a request from a client application, transmits a set of data access transactions to the respective server applications, receives a set of responses from the server applications, and integrates the set of responses for presentation to the client application (Col. 2, lines 50-65). There is no teaching or suggestion that this gateway node itself executes its own tasks or has its own log system to which modified log messages from other nodes are appended to.

The other references cited in the Claim 10 rejection have similar teaching deficiencies. For example, the cited Kahn reference teaches a single node having an ability to organize received results in accordance with user preferences (Col. 17, lines 14-20). However, this single node is the original, requesting computer (Col. 16, lines 50-58) and this node does not append any modified results to its own existing results on this node, the existing results comprising results of execution for one or more tasks executed on this node. Quite simply, there is no teaching or suggestion of modifying received results (results from other tasks on other nodes) and appending such modified results to existing results (results from tasks on this node). Thus, it is shown that Claim 10 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and therefore has been erroneously rejected.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claims 11-17 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 10 (of which Claims 11-17 depend upon).

Further with respect to Claim 11, Appellants further show error in that none of the cited references teach or suggest a node the modifies results from a task executed on another node, and then this modified result is transmitted to a requesting node. As described above, the Kahn node that re-organizes received results is the requesting node itself, so there would be no reason or other motivation to transmit the re-organized results to a requesting node, as they already exist at the requesting node. Thus, Claim 11 is further shown to have been erroneously rejected.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claim 27 (and dependent Claims 28-34) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 10.

Further with respect to Claim 28, Appellants further show error for similar further reasons given above regarding Claim 11.

Appellants show error in the rejection of Claim 44 (and dependent Claims 45-51) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 10.

Further with respect to Claim 45, Appellants further show error for similar further reasons given above regarding Claim 11.

Appellants further urge that due to the large number of references being used in rejecting Claims 10-17, 27-34 and 44-51, the Examiner must be using improper hindsight analysis, using the present invention itself as a blueprint to establish obviousness (see *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, supra). In combining the teachings of Moharram with those of Navarre and Wang, the Examiner states that the motivation to combine these references is to provide the client with important administrative information together with the results requested by the client. However, Appellants urge (as previously detailed above) that this motivation comes from the present application itself, and not from the cited references, thus evidencing improper hindsight analysis.

In summary, the references have been combined using improper hindsight analysis, and even when improperly combined, there are still missing claimed elements – strongly evidencing non-obviousness. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 10-17, 27-34 and 44-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is shown to be in error.

In conclusion, none of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest a plurality of intervening nodes that modify task results received from other nodes, or a node that modifies task results received from another mode and appends such modified results to its own task results. Certain references have also been improperly combined using hindsight analysis, where the present application itself was used as a blueprint in establishing obviousness. Therefore, it is respectfully urged that the claims have been erroneously rejected. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed as having been erroneously made.

Duke W. Yee
Reg. No. 34,285
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

The text of the claims involved in the appeal are:

1. A method for managing result information in a multi-node networked data processing system, the method comprising:

receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node in the networked data processing system, wherein the first results comprise an array of result messages;

modifying, at the first node, at least one of the result messages to create second results, wherein the second results comprise a second array of result messages including the modified result message(s);

receiving, at a third node, the second results;

modifying, at the third node, at least one of the second result messages to create third results, wherein the third results comprise a third array of result messages including the modified second result message(s); and

sending the third results to a requesting client node.

2. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the result messages comprise at least one log entry.

3. The method as recited in claim 2, wherein the log entry comprises a system log.

4. The method as recited in claim 2, wherein the log entry comprises a security log.

5. The method as recited in claim 2, wherein the log entry comprises an audit log.

6. The method as recited in claim 2, wherein the log entry comprises an application log.

7. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein at least one of the entries in the result messages is an error message and includes a severity field indicating a severity of the error.

8. The method as recited in claim 7, wherein the severity field is a warning.

9. The method as recited in claim 7, wherein the severity field is an informational field.

10. A method for transmitting log entries within result data structures through a chain of nodes in a multi-node networked data processing system, the method comprising:

sending, from a first node, a command request to a second node;

receiving, at the first node, a result of execution from the second node, wherein the result of execution contains both a program result from one or more tasks executed and a set of log messages, wherein each log message contains a unique identifier and associated text content; and

modifying, at the first node, at least one of the log messages in the set of log messages received in the result to produce a modified result and appending the modified result to an existing log system on the first node, the existing log system comprising a first node result of execution from one or more tasks executed by the first node.

11. The method as recited in claim 10, further comprising:

transmitting the modified result to a requesting node.

12. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein at least some of the set of log messages in the modified result are identical to corresponding log messages in the result.

13. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein the modified result contains all of the log messages contained within the result.

14. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein the modified result contains none of the log messages contained within the result.

15. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein the step of modifying comprises placing a modified log entry in the modified results corresponding to an unmodified log entry in the set of log messages in the results.

16. The method as recited in claim 10, wherein modifying the set of log messages comprises translating at least one of the log entries in the set of log entries from a first language into a primary language of the requesting client node if the first language is different from the primary language of the requesting client node.

17. The method as recited in claim 16, wherein the translating the log entries comprises matching the message identification of a log entry with a corresponding replacement text in the primary language of the requesting client node.

18. A computer program product in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system for managing result information in a multi-node networked data processing system;, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node in the networked data processing system, wherein the first results comprise an array of result messages;

second instructions for modifying, at the first node, at least one of the result messages to create second results, wherein the second results comprise a second array of result messages including the modified result message(s);

third instructions for receiving, at a third node, the second results;

fourth instructions for modifying, at the third node, at least one of the second result messages to create third results, wherein the third results comprise a third array of result messages including the modified second result message(s);

fifth instructions for sending the third results to a requesting client node.

19. The computer program product as recited in claim 18, wherein the result messages comprise at least one log entry.

20. The computer program product as recited in claim 19, wherein the log entry comprises a system log.

21. The computer program product as recited in claim 19, wherein the log entry comprises a security log.

22. The computer program product as recited in claim 19, wherein the log entry comprises an audit log.

23. The computer program product as recited in claim 19, wherein the log entry comprises an application log.

24. The computer program product as recited in claim 18, wherein at least one of the entries in the result messages is an error message and includes a severity field indicating a severity of the error.

25. The computer program product as recited in claim 24, wherein the severity field is a warning.

26. The computer program product as recited in claim 24, wherein the severity field is an informational field.

27. A computer program product in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system for transmitting log entries within result data structures through a chain of nodes in a multi-node networked data processing system, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for sending, from a first node, a command request to a second node;

second instructions for receiving, at the first node, a result of execution from the second node, wherein the result of execution contains both a program result from one or more tasks executed and a set of log messages, wherein each log message contains a unique identifier and associated text content; and

third instructions for modifying, at the first node, at least one of the log messages in the set of log messages received in the result to produce a modified result and appending the modified result to an existing log system on the first node, the existing log system comprising a first node result of execution from one or more tasks executed by the first node.

28. The computer program product as recited in claim 27, further comprising:

fourth instructions for transmitting the modified result to a requesting node.

29. The computer program product as recited in claim 27, wherein at least some of the set of log messages in the modified result are identical to corresponding log messages in the result.

30. The computer program product as recited in claim 27, wherein the modified result contains all of the log messages contained within the result.

31. The computer program product as recited in claim 27, wherein the modified result contains none of the log messages contained within the result.

32. The computer program product as recited in claim 27, wherein the step of modifying comprises placing a modified log entry in the modified results corresponding to an unmodified log entry in the set of log messages in the results.

33. The computer program product as recited in claim 27, wherein modifying the set of log messages comprises translating at least one of the log entries in the set of log entries from a first language into a primary language of the requesting client node if the first language is different from the primary language of the requesting client node.

34. The computer program product as recited in claim 33, wherein the translating the log entries comprises matching the message identification of a log entry with a corresponding replacement text in the primary language of the requesting client node.

35. (Previously Presented) A system for managing result information in a multi-node networked data processing system;, the system comprising:

first means for receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node in the networked data processing system, wherein the first results comprise an array of result messages;

second means for modifying, at the first node, at least one of the result messages to create second results, wherein the second results comprise a second array of result messages including the modified result message(s);

third means for receiving, at a third node, the second results;

fourth means for modifying, at the third node, at least one of the second result messages to create third results, wherein the third results comprise a third array of result messages including the modified second result message(s);

fifth means for sending the second results to a requesting client node.

36. The system as recited in claim 35, wherein the result messages comprise at least one log entry.

37. The system as recited in claim 36, wherein the log entry comprises a system log.

38. The system as recited in claim 36, wherein the log entry comprises a security log.

39. The system as recited in claim 36, wherein the log entry comprises an audit log.

40. The system as recited in claim 36, wherein the log entry comprises an application log.

41. The system as recited in claim 35, wherein at least one of the entries in the result messages is an error message and includes a severity field indicating a severity of the error.

42. The system as recited in claim 41, wherein the severity field is a warning.

43. The system as recited in claim 41, wherein the severity field is an informational field.

44. A system for transmitting log entries within result data structures through a chain of nodes in a multi-node networked data processing system, the system comprising:

first means for sending, from a first node, a command request to a second node;

second means for receiving, at the first node, a result of execution from the second node, wherein the result of execution contains both a program result from one or more tasks executed and an array of log messages, wherein each log message contains a unique identifier and associated text content; and

third means for modifying, at the first node, at least one of the log messages in the set of log messages received in the result to produce a modified result and appending the modified result to an existing log system on the first node, the existing log system comprising a first node result of execution from one or more tasks executed by the first node.

45. The system as recited in claim 44, further comprising:

fourth means for transmitting the modified result to a requesting node.

46. The system as recited in claim 44, wherein at least some of the set of log messages in the modified result are identical to corresponding log messages in the result.

47. The system as recited in claim 44, wherein the modified result contains all of the log messages contained within the result.

48. The system as recited in claim 44, wherein the modified result contains none of the log messages contained within the result.

49. The system as recited in claim 44, wherein the step of modifying comprises placing a modified log entry in the modified results corresponding to an unmodified log entry in the set of log messages in the results.

50. The system as recited in claim 44, wherein modifying the set of log messages comprises translating at least one of the log entries in the set of log entries from a first language into a primary language of the requesting client node if the first language is different from the primary language of the requesting client node.

51. The system as recited in claim 50, wherein the translating the log entries comprises matching the message identification of a log entry with a corresponding replacement text in the primary language of the requesting client node.